arXiv:1406.0328v2 [math.AG] 28 Jan 2015

STABLY NEWTON NON-DEGENERATE SINGULARITIES

JAN STEVENS

Abstract. We discuss a problem of Arnold, whether every function is stably equivalent to one which is non-degenerate for its Newton diagram. The answer is negative. The easiest example can be given in characteristic p: the function x^p is not stably equivalent to a non-degenerate function. To deal with characteristic zero we describe a method to make functions non-degenerate after suspension and give an example of a surface singularity where this method does not work. We conjecture that it is in fact not stably equivalent to a non-degenerate function.

We argue that irreducible plane curves with an arbitrary number of Puiseux pairs are stably non-degenerate. As the suspension involves many variables, it becomes very difficult to determine the Newton diagram in general, but the form of the equation indicates that it is non-degenerate.

Introduction

Many invariants of a hypersurface singularity can be computed from its Newton diagram, if the singularity is non-degenerate. Although almost all singularities with a given diagram are non-degenerate, most singularities are degenerate in every coordinate system. Sometimes it is possible to find suitable coordinates after a suspension with a quadratic form in new variables, and invariants computed from the Newton diagram of the suspension allow conclusions about the original singularity. A successful case is the study of Luengo's example [Lu] of a non-smooth μ-const stratum in [St]. The fact that one can make a singularity non-degenerate by a coordinate transformation after adding variables was observed by Arnold, who raised the question whether this is always possible.

Problem 3 of Arnold's list [Arn] in the Arcata volume reads:

> *Is every function stably equivalent to a Γ-non-degenerate function (in a neighbourhood of a critical point of finite multiplicity)?*

The answer is no, and an example is provided by the simplest degenerate function in finite characteristic, the polynomial x^p in char p. This is immediate for a somewhat modified concept of non-degeneracy, originally due to Wall [Wa] and studied in char p by Boubakri, Greuel and Markwig [BGM]. But also for the classical notion of non-degeneracy the polynomial x^p is a counterexample.

This negative answer does not extend to the case of real or complex functions. I found a number of succesful cases, using basically only one trick, which however carries a long way. By lack of counterexamples I expected that every function

could be made non-degenerate. The first indication that this is not true came by considering deformations on the μ-const stratum in Luengo's example. A more careful analysis of the succesful cases then showed that often the principal part of the degenerate function lies in I^2, where I is the ideal defining the singular locus on the torus. For a function f to be singular along the zero set of I it suffices that f lies in the primitive ideal $\int I$ [Pe, Se]. Therefore we search for a counterexample using functions $f \in \int I \setminus I^2$. The easiest example is the series of singularities

$$f_{7+3k} = x^5 + xy^3 + z^3 - 3x^2yz + x^k \ .$$

The principal part is given by the following symmetric determinant

$$-\begin{vmatrix} x & y & z \\ y & z & x^2 \\ z & x^2 & xy \end{vmatrix} \ ,$$

with I generated by the minors of the first two rows. My methods do not work in this example. This does not exclude the possibility that some unknown, complicated transformation makes these functions non-degenerate after suspension. The nicest proof that this cannot occur, would be to have a discrete invariant, which for non-degenerate functions can be computed from the Newton diagram and such that its value for the functions f_{7+3k} can never be obtained from a Newton diagram. The ζ-function of the monodromy comes to mind, but it is not suitable for this purpose, as it is the same for f_{7+3k} and $T_{3,5,3k}$.

In the last section evidence is presented that every irreducible plane curve singularity (with an arbitrary number of Puiseux pairs) is stably equivalent to a non-degenerate singularity. The number of variables is rapidly increasing, making it difficult to check non-degeneracy. Therefore I in fact leave this as a conjecture. Degeneracy means that there are relations between the coefficients of the occurring monomials. In the examples there are no longer any obvious relations, and it seems possible to make the coefficients generic. I refer to this situation as *seemingly* non-degenerate.

Acknowledgement. I thank Claus Hertling for the decisive question about non-degeneracy for singularities on a non-smooth μ-const stratum.

1. Non-degenerate functions

We recall the standard definitions of non-degeneracy, given by Kouchnirenko [Kou], and the related concepts of Wall [Wa].

Let $f \in k[[x_1, \ldots, x_n]]$ be a formal power series over a field k, with algebraic closure K. Write (in multi-index notation) $f = \sum a_m x^m$ and let $\Gamma_+(f)$ be the convex hull of the set $\bigcup_{m:\, a_m \neq 0}(m + \mathbb{R}^n_+) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. The *Newton diagram* $\Gamma(f)$ of f is the union of all compact faces of $\Gamma_+(f)$. The union $\Gamma_-(f)$ of all segments connecting the origin and the Newton diagram is the *Newton polytope*. The series f is *convenient* if for every $1 \leq i \leq n$ there is a m_i such that the monomial $x_i^{m_i}$

occurs with non-zero coefficient, that is, the Newton diagram of f has a vertex on each coordinate axis.

Let Δ be a face of $\Gamma(f)$. One denotes the polynomial $\sum_{m\in\Delta} a_m x^m$ by f_Δ. The *principal part* of f is the polynomial $f_\Gamma = \sum_{m\in\Gamma(f)} a_m x^m$

Definition 1.1. The series f is *non-degenerate* if for every closed face $\Delta \subset \Gamma(f)$ the polynomials

$$x_1\frac{\partial f_\Delta}{\partial x_1}, \dots, x_n\frac{\partial f_\Delta}{\partial x_n}$$

have no common zero on the torus $(K^*)^n$.

This condition depends only on the principal part of the series f.

If f is non-degenerate, many invariants can be computed from the Newton diagram. We concentrate here on the *Milnor number* $\mu(f) = \dim_k k[[x]]/(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x})$. Note that $\mu(f)$ can be infinite.

For any compact polytope S in $\mathbb{R}^n_+$ with the origin as vertex we denote by $V_k(S)$ the sum of the k-dimensional volumes of the intersections of S with the k-dimensional coordinate subspaces of $\mathbb{R}^n$, and we define its *Newton number* to be

$$\nu(S) = \sum_{k=0}^{n}(-1)^{n-k}k!V_k(S)\ .$$

The Newton number $\nu(f)$ of f is the Newton number of $\Gamma_-(f)$.

The main result of Kouchnirenko [Kou] is:

Theorem 1.2. *For every series f one has $\mu(f) \geq \nu(f)$. Equality holds if f is convenient and nondegenerate.*

For non-degenerate holomorphic function germs, which are not necessarily convenient, the meaning of the number $\nu(f)$ is given by a theorem of Varchenko [Va]:

Theorem 1.3. *For a non-degenerate series $f \in \mathbb{C}\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ the Newton number $\nu(f)$ is equal to $(-1)^{n-1}(\chi(F)-1)$, where $\chi(F)$ is the Euler characteristic of the Milnor fibre.*

Note that our definition of $\nu(f)$ for non-convenient series is not the same as that of Kouchnirenko, who takes the supremum of $\nu(f + \sum x_i^m)$. Under our definition $\mu(f) = \nu(f)$ implies that $\mu(f)$ is finite. Our definition of $\mu(f)$ is the same as his, so in particular $\mu(f) = \infty$ for non-isolated singularities, and it is not related to the Euler characteristic of the Milnor fibre.

For non-degeneracy one can as well require that the functions $\frac{\partial f_\Delta}{\partial x_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial f_\Delta}{\partial x_n}$ have no common zero on $(K^*)^n$. In finite characteristic this condition is not the same as that the Tjurina ideal $(f_\Delta, \frac{\partial f_\Delta}{\partial x})$ has no common zeroes. The function f is *weakly non-degenerate* if this latter condition is satisfied for every facet (i.e., top-dimensional face) of the Newton diagram.

To treat isolated singularities, which are not convenient, Wall [Wa] introduced a somewhat different notion of non-degeneracy, which allows to extend the Newton filtration of the given diagram to the whole power series ring. The prototype of this situation is the case of semi-quasihomogeneous functions, where the Newton diagram may have more compact faces than its quasihomogeneous part, but one only works with the filtration coming from the quasihomogeneous weights. One starts from a diagram Γ, for which the intersection points with the coordinate axes need not be lattice points, but which otherwise has the same properties as a Newton diagram of a convenient function. In particular one requires that the closed region Γ_+ on and above it is convex and that central projection onto the unit simplex is a bijection. We call such a diagram a C-diagram. A face Δ is an *inner face* of Γ if it is not contained in any coordinate hyperplane. The non-degeneracy condition is stronger, but will be required for less faces.

Let $Q = (q_1, \ldots, q_n) \in K^n$ be a common zero of $\frac{\partial f_\Delta}{\partial x_1}, \ldots, \frac{\partial f_\Delta}{\partial x_n}$. We set $I_Q = \{i \mid q_i \neq 0\}$. For an arbitrary subset $I \subset \{1, \ldots, n\}$ we denote the coordinate subspace $\{(r_1, \ldots, r_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid r_i = 0 \text{ if } i \notin I\}$ by $\mathbb{R}^I$. So $\mathbb{R}^{I_Q} = \bigcap_{q_i=0}\{r_i = 0\}$.

Definition 1.4. The series f is *inner non-degenerate* with respect to a C-diagram Γ if for every *inner* face Δ the following holds: $\Delta \cap \mathbb{R}^{I_Q} = \emptyset$ for each common zero Q of the ideal $(\frac{\partial f_\Delta}{\partial x_1}, \ldots, \frac{\partial f_\Delta}{\partial x_n})$.

We then have:

Theorem 1.5 (Wall)**.** *If the series f is inner non-degenerate w.r.t. a C-diagram Γ, then $\mu(f) < \infty$ and*

$$\mu(f) = \nu(\Gamma_-(f)) = \nu(\Gamma_-) \ .$$

As observed by Boubakri, Greuel and Markwig [BGM] (whose terminology we follow), the result of Wall also holds in finite characteristic. For a comparison of the different concepts of non-degeneracy we refer to their paper.

The converse of Theorem 1.2 does not hold in general: for degenerate series it can be that $\mu(f) = \nu(f)$. The simplest example is the function $(y+x)^2 + xz + z^2$ [Kou, Remarque 1.21]. Counterexamples also exist for two variables in finite characteristic: $f = xy + x^p + y^p$ has $\mu(f) = \nu(f) = 1$, but is degenerate in char p [GN, Example 2.1]. The precise consequences of the condition $\mu(f) = \nu(f)$ for functions of two variables are investigated in [GN]. The result is that f is inner non-degenerate. In characteristic zero it follows that f is non-degenerate. In that case the function can only degenerate on edges and the result follows from the fact that f is equisingular to a non-degenerate function and Newton's method to parametrise branches.

A method to compute $\nu(f)$ without determining the faces of the Newton diagram is to compute the Milnor number of a general enough function with the same Newton diagram, say with Singular [DGPS]. Taking all coefficients equal to 1 might not be general enough; in my experience a good choice is to use the

coefficients $1, 2, 3, \ldots, k$, if there are k monomials. A first test for non-degeneracy is that $\nu(f) = \mu(f)$, but this is not sufficient. The problem is that $\mu(f)$ is related to the multiplicity of Jacobian ideal $J(f) = (\frac{\partial f}{\partial x})$, whereas the Newton diagram has to do with the ideal $I(f) = (x\frac{\partial f}{\partial x})$. In fact, by using this last ideal one gets a necessary and sufficient condition [Bi]. If the ideal $I(f)$ has finite codimension (implying in particular that f is convenient), then f is non-degenerate if and only if the multiplicity of $I(f)$ is to $n!V_n(\Gamma_-(f))$, see [Bi, Thm 4.1], and $n!V_n(\Gamma_-(f))$ can be computed as the multiplicity of $I(g)$ for a general enough function g with the same convenient Newton diagram.

2. Finite characteristic

In finite characteristic it is no longer true that the Milnor number is invariant under contact equivalence. The simplest example is the function $f(x) = x^p$ in characteristic p with $\mu(f) = \infty$, while $\mu(g) = p$ for the contact equivalent function $g(x) = (1+x)f(x) = x^p + x^{p+1}$. As the Milnor number of an inner non-degenerate function is finite (Theorem 1.5), we obtain directly the following result.

Proposition 2.1. *The function x^p, $\operatorname{char} k = p$, is not stably equivalent to an inner non-degenerate function.*

Examples with functions of two variables are easy to make: $x^p + y^a$ will do.

Theorem 2.2. *The function x^p, $\operatorname{char} k = p$, is not stably equivalent to a non-degenerate function.*

Proof. Suppose that the function $f = x_1^p \in k[[x_1]]$, $\operatorname{char} k = p$, is stably equivalent to a non-degenerate function $g \in K[[x_1, \ldots, x_n]]$.

We claim that $\mu(\tilde{g}) = \infty$ for any function $\tilde{g}$, in any characteristic, with the same Newton diagram as g. Consider functions of the form $g + \sum a_i x_i^m$, with m not divisible by p. For large m and generic a_i such a function is non-degenerate and its Milnor number is equal to its Newton number. As $\mu(g) = \infty$, also $\underline{\lim}_{m\to\infty} \mu(g + \sum a_i x_i^m) = \infty$. Then $\underline{\lim}_{m\to\infty} \mu(\tilde{g}_m) = \infty$ for generic $\tilde{g}_m$ with the same Newton diagram. By semi-continuity of the Milnor number this is only possible if $\mu(\tilde{g}) = \infty$.

By assumption the series g is equivalent to $f + Q$ with Q a quadratic form of rank $n - 1$. Therefore the corank of g is at most 1. So for a generic function $\tilde{g}$ in characteristic zero with the same diagram the corank is also at most one. By the splitting lemma such a function is right-equivalent to $x_1^l + x_2^2 + \cdots + x_n^2$ for some $l \leq \infty$, and as $\mu(\tilde{g}) = \infty$, we have in fact $l = \infty$. This implies that $\tilde{g}$ is right-equivalent to its 2-jet. The equivalence can be constructed one order at a time (cf. the proof of the splitting lemma in [GLS, Thm I.2.47]). The same construction then works in characteristic p and gives that the generic $\tilde{g}$ is right-equivalent to its 2-jet. But this should then also hold for the original function g, which is right-equivalent to a suspension of x^p. This contradiction shows that no such non-degenerate g can exist. □

3. The basic trick

Let f be a (degenerate) function of the form $f = g + m\varphi^k$, where m is any function, but preferably a monomial. Then we can remove the term $m\varphi^k$ by a double suspension:

Lemma 3.1. *The function $f = g+m\varphi^k$ is stably equivalent to $-uv+u\varphi+mv^k+g$.*

Proof.

$$-\left(u - m\frac{v^k - \varphi^k}{v - \varphi}\right)(v - \varphi) + m\varphi^k = -uv + u\varphi + mv^k \ .$$

□

This formula includes the special case $k = 1$: one has that $g + m\varphi$ is stably equivalent to $-uv + u\varphi + vm + g$. We note also the case $m = 1$ and $k = 2$, where we have $f = g + \varphi^2$. The basic trick gives $-uv + u\varphi + v^2 + g$, to which we apply the coordinate transformation $v = \bar{v} + \frac{1}{2}u$, yielding $\bar{v}^2 + \frac{1}{4}u^2 + u\varphi + g$, so f is also stably equivalent $\frac{1}{4}u^2 + u\varphi + g$; this is the obvious way to treat this case.

Corollary 3.2. *Every polynomial is stably equivalent to a polynomial of degree three.*

Proof. A product $m\varphi$ of degree $d + e$ with $e - 1 \leq d \leq e$ can be replaced by $-uv + u\varphi + vm$ with summands of degrees 2, $e+1$ and $d+1$, which are less than $d + e$ except when $d = 1$ and $e = 2$. □

Remark 3.3. If $f = g + m_1\varphi^{k_1} + m_2\varphi^{k_2}$, we can apply our basic trick twice to get

$$-u_1v_1 - u_2v_2 + (u_1 + u_2)\varphi + m_1v_1^{k_1} + m_2v_2^{k_2} + g$$

after which we make $u_1 + u_2$ into a new variable, say by replacing u_2 by $u_2 - u_1$, giving

$$-u_1v_1 + u_1v_2 - u_2v_2 + u_2\varphi + m_1v_1^{k_1} + m_2v_2^{k_2} + g$$

This procedure generalises to more terms.

Example 3.4. Let $f = x^9 + y(xy^3 + z^4)^2 + y^{10}$ (this is Luengo's example [Lu]) Then f is stably equivalent to

$$-uv + u(xy^3 + z^4) + yv^2 + y^{10} \ .$$

We can even make the 1-parameter deformation $f_t = f + tx^5(xy^3 + z^4)$ stable non-degenerate by the transformation $u \mapsto u - tx^5$, resulting in $-uv + u(xy^3 + z^4) + yv^2 + tvx^5 + y^{10}$.

We give some more examples of surface singularities of Lê-Yomdin type:

$$f = f_d + l^k$$

where f_d defines a projective hypersurface with isolated singular points, and l defines a linear form, not passing through the singularities. Suppose f_d is degenerate, but is stably equivalent to $q + \tilde{f}_d$, with coordinate transformations not

changing the original coordinates. Then $q + \tilde{f} + l^k$ may degenerate on the face defined by l^k. This can be remedied by the basic trick, giving $q+\tilde{f}-uv+ul+v^k$. The suspension is not necessary, if l is itself a coordinate function. In practice this will be the case. Otherwise we can start with a coordinate transformation, but one has to be careful not to make f_d too complicated. This said, we will concentrate on making f_d non-degenerate.

Example 3.5 (A cubic curve with one double point)**.** In this case the Lê-Yomdin singularity is just $T_{3,3,k}$, which is non-degenerate in its standard normal form, where the the double point lies at the origin of the affine (x, y) chart.

If the double point is a general point, we can preceed as follows. Write its tangent cone as $m_1^2 + m_2^2$, where m_1 and m_2 are independent linear forms. There are linear forms l_1 and l_2 such that the equation has the form

$$f_3 = l_1 m_1^2 + l_2 m_2^2 \ .$$

The polynomial f_3 is stably equivalent to

$$-u_1v_1 - u_2v_2 + u_1m_1 + u_2m_2 + v_1^2 l_1 + v_2^2 l_2 \ ,$$

which for general l_1, l_2, m_1 and m_2 is non-degenerate.

Example 3.6 (A cubic with three double points)**.** The equation has the form $f_3 = l_1l_2l_3$. If the singular points lie in general position we apply the basic trick, first once:

$$-u_1v_1 + u_1l_1 + v_1l_2l_3$$

and then once again:

$$-u_1v_1 - u_2v_2 + u_1l_1 + u_2l_2 + v_1v_2l_3 \ .$$

Example 3.7 (A quartic with four double points)**.** Now it is no longer possible to place the double points at the vertices of the coordinate triangle. The four points are a complete intersection of two conics and the equation has just the form $f_4 = q_1q_2$, where q_1 and q_2 are nonsingular. This is stably equivalent to

$$-uv + uq_1 + vq_2 \ .$$

Example 3.8 (A quintic with four double points)**.** Let the four points again be given by q_1 and q_2. The general quintic with nodes at the four points can be written as

$$f_5 = l_1q_1^2 + l_2(q_1 + q_2)^2 + l_3q_2^2$$

with the l_i linear forms. Now we first form

$$-u_1v_1 - u_2v_2 - u_3v_3 + u_1q_1 + u_2(q_1 + q_2) + u_3q_3 + v_1^2l_1 + v_2^2l_2 + v_3^2l_3$$

and then we replace u_1 by $u_1 - u_2$ and u_3 by $u_3 - u_2$, resulting in

$$-u_1v_1 + u_2v_1 - u_2v_2 + u_2v_3 - u_3v_3 + u_1q_1 + u_3q_2 + v_1^2l_1 + v_2^2l_2 + v_3^2l_3 \ .$$

Remark 3.9. Our strategy is to remove a face on which the function degenerates. Terms above the original Newton diagram can now end up on the new diagram, and we have to take care of new degeneracies. This process might never stop. As a simple example, consider a plane curve with equation of the form $f = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \varphi_i^2$, where the φ_i have pairwise no common divisors. Each term φ_i can be replaced by $-z_i^2 + 2z_i\varphi_i$, but we need infinitely many new variables. However, under our assumptions on the φ_i we actually have an isolated singularity, so f is finitely determined and right-equivalent to a polynomial of the form $\sum_{i=1}^{N} \varphi_i^2$ and therefore stably equivalent to $\sum_{i=1}^{N} -z_i^2 + 2z_i\varphi_i$.

4. A counterexample?

The previous section contains examples, where we succeeded to make a singularity non-degenerate after supension. The coordinate transformations used take advantage of the specific form of the degenerate equation. We first investigate its properties. Then we are able to give a degenerate function, which is not of this form.

Let f be a degenerate function, so there is a closed face δ and an $a \in (K^*)^n$ such that $\frac{\partial f_\delta}{\partial x_i}(a) = 0$ for all i. Our approach leads to a function

$$F_\Delta = f_\delta - \sum_{i=1}^{m} (u_i - \phi_i)(v_i - \psi_i) \ ,$$

where the functions ϕ_i, ψ_i may depend on the variables u_j, v_j; we assume them to be weighted homogeneous, compatible with the weights determined by the face δ, so F_Δ is again weighted homogeneous, and all monomials lie on a face Δ.

The simplest situation is that ϕ_i, ψ_i do not depend on the variables u_j, v_j. If $f_\delta = \sum \phi_i\psi_i$, we remove in this way all monomials on the face δ. We need that F_Δ does not degenerate on Δ and its faces, so we want that the singular locus of F_Δ lies in $u_i = v_i = 0$ for all i. This means that $\phi_i \in I$ and $\psi_i \in I$, where I is the ideal of the reduced singular locus of f_Δ. This gives $f_\delta \in I^2$, a condition which implies that f_δ is singular along $V(I)$. It is however not certain that we can write f_δ in this way, as it is not a necessary condition.

The correct condition is that $f_\delta \in \int I$, where $\int I$ is the *primitive ideal* [Se, Pe]:

$$\int I = \{g \in K[[x_1, \ldots, x_n]] \mid \left(\frac{\partial g}{\partial x_{x_i}}\right) \subset I\} \ .$$

The terminology is from Pellikaan [Pe]. One has $I^2 \subset \int I$, but in general these ideals are different. An example occurs in Example 3.6: the product $f = l_1l_2l_3$ has singular locus given by the ideal $I = (l_1l_2, l_1l_3, l_2l_3)$, so $f \in \int I \setminus I^2$.

In general, the functions ϕ_i, ψ_i depend on the variables u_j, v_j. Let $a \in (K^*)^n$ be a singular point, Using the values $x_l = a_l$ we solve the equations $u_j - \phi_j = 0$, $v_k - \psi_k = 0$. We denote the obtained values by $u_j(a)$, $v_k(a)$, so that we have $u_j(a) - \phi_j(a) = 0$, $v_k(a) - \psi_k(a) = 0$ for all j, k. Then $(a, u(a), v(a)) :=$

$(a_1, \ldots, a_n, u_1(a), \ldots, u_m(a), v_1(a), \ldots, v_m(a))$ is a singular point of F_Δ. The non-degeneracy condition is that $(a, u(a), v(a)) \notin (K^*)^{n+2m}$. This means that some $u_j(a) = 0$ or $v_k(a) = 0$. Let $J = \{j \mid u_j(a) = 0\}$ and $K = \{k \mid v_k = 0\}$. In F_Δ we put $u_j = 0$ for all $j \in J$ and $v_k = 0$ for all $k \in K$. The result is $F_{\Delta'}$ with Δ' the intersection of Δ with a suitable coordinate subspace in $\mathbb{R}^{n+2m}$. Then $(a, u(a), v(a))$ is still a singular point of $F_{\Delta'}$, but as $F_{\Delta'}$ does not depend on the u_j and v_k with $j \in J$ and $k \in K$, we also get singular points in $(K^*)^{n+2m}$. The assumption that F_Δ is non-degenerate implies that $\Delta' = \emptyset$. In particular, for all $1 \leq i \leq m$ we have $u_i(a) = 0$ or $v_i(a) = 0$. We nay assume that $u_i(a) = 0$ for all i. Let k be the smallest ndex such that $v_k(a) \neq 0$. The term $v_k\phi_k$ in the expression for $F_{\Delta'}$ is cancelled by other terms in $\sum_{i\neq k} \phi_i\psi_i$ (this happens in Example 3.6). We then can start reasoning about the terms in the expression for ϕ_k.

To find a counterexample we look at functions $f_\delta \in \int I \setminus I^2$, with I a reduced ideal. We take $V(I)$ irreducible intersecting the coordinate hyperplanes only at the origin. Interesting examples can be found in the work of De Jong and Van Straten on rational quadruple points [JS, Sect. 1]. The easiest example is the following. Let $V(I)$ be the monomial curve (t^3, t^4, t^5). Its ideal is given by the minors of a 2×3 matrix. To define f_δ we add one row to obtain the following symmetric 3×3 determinant:

$$f_\delta = -\begin{vmatrix} x & y & z \\ y & z & x^2 \\ z & x^2 & xy \end{vmatrix} .$$

It is easily seen that all 2×2 minors lie in the ideal I, so by the product rule the partial derivatives of f_δ lie also in I, showing that $f_\delta \in \int I$.

We find isolated singularities in three related series by adding suitable monomials:

$$\begin{aligned} f_{7+3k} &= x^5 + xy^3 + z^3 - 3x^2yz + x^k \\ f_{8+3k} &= x^5 + xy^3 + z^3 - 3x^2yz + x^{k-1}y \\ f_{9+3k} &= x^5 + xy^3 + z^3 - 3x^2yz + x^{k-1}z \end{aligned}$$

The lower index denotes the Milnor number. We can write it as $\mu = 7 + v$, where v denotes the weight of the monomial $f_\mu - f_\delta$ (using the weights $3, 4, 5$).

The singularity f_{7+v} has $p_g(f_{7+v}) = 2$; it is (weakly) elliptic with the same resolution graph as the maximal elliptic singularity $z^2 + y^3 + y^2x^8 + x^{9+v}$, which has $p_g = 4$. It has $Z^2 = -1$, there is a cycle of $v - 15$ rational curves, all but one having self intersection -2, and at the only (-3)-curve a chain of three (-2)-curves is attached.

Conjecture 4.1. *The function f_{7+v} for $v > 15$ is stably degenerate.*

The discussion above shows that our methods cannot make these functions stably non-degenerate, but it does not exclude the existence of a very strange coordinate transformation, which does the trick. The nicest proof that this cannot

occur, would be to have a discrete invariant, which for non-degenerate functions can be computed from the Newton diagram and such that its value for the functions f_{7+3k} can never be obtained from a Newton diagram. An involved, but not too complicated invariant is the ζ-function of the monodromy comes to mind. Using Siersma's formula [Si] we find

$$\zeta(t) = (1-t^v)(1-t^5)(1-t^3)\ .$$

This is the same ζ-function as for $T_{3,5,v}$, och therefore the ζ-function is not suitable for our purpose.

5. Irreducible plane curve singularities

In this section we give evidence that all irreducible plane curve singularities are stably non-degenerate.

The number of variables increases rapidly, making it difficult to determine the faces of the Newton diagram. Typically the polynomial φ, responsible for degeneracy, occurs in the final result on its own, only multiplied with a monomial. Changing the coefficients of φ presumably does not influence the Milnor number. We refer to this situation as *seemingly non-degenerate* and formulate this concept in a rather imprecise definition.

Definition 5.1. We say that a series is *seemingly non-degenerate* if changing arbitrarily the coefficients in the formula leads to arbitrary changes of the coefficients of the monomials on the Newton diagram.

Admittedly, as we typically do not vary the 2-jet of the series, we cannot be sure without actually doing the computation that our series is general enough for its Newton diagram. So the use of our rather vague term actually implies a conjecture, that the series really is non-degenerate.

We describe equations for irreducible plane curve singularities following Teissier [Te], see also [C-N]. We look at algebroid curves over an algebraically closed field K of characteristic zero. The basic invariant is the semi-group.

Let $S = \langle \bar\beta_0, \dots, \bar\beta_g\rangle$ be the semigroup of the curve. Define numbers n_i by $e_i = \gcd(\bar\beta_0, \dots, \bar\beta_i)$ and $e_{i-1} = n_i e_i$. The condition that S comes from a plane curve singularity, is that $n_i\bar\beta_i \in \langle \bar\beta_0, \dots, \bar\beta_{i-1}\rangle$ and $n_i\bar\beta_i < \bar\beta_{i+1}$.

Remark 5.2. The semigroup S determines the Puiseux characteristic

$$(\beta_0; \beta_1, \dots, \beta_g)\ ,$$

where $\beta_0 = n = \bar\beta_0$ is the multiplicity of the curve, by $\beta_1 = \bar\beta_1$ and the formula $\beta_i - \beta_{n-1} = \bar\beta_i - n_{i-1}\bar\beta_{n-1}$. Putting $\beta_i = m_i e_i$ gives the Puiseux pairs (m_i, n_i), $i = 1, \dots, g$.

Teissier showed that every plane curve singularity with semigroup S occurs in the positive weight part of versal deformation of the monomial curve C_S with this

semigroup. Embed C_S in K^{g+1} by $u_i = t^{\bar\beta_i}$. Write

$$n_i\bar\beta_i = l_0^{(i)}\bar\beta_0 + l_1^{(i)}\bar\beta_1 + \cdots + l_{i-1}^{(i)}\bar\beta_{i-1}\ .$$

The curve C_S is a complete intersection with equations

$$\begin{aligned} f_1 &= u_1^{n_1} - u_0^{l_0^{(1)}} = 0\\ f_2 &= u_2^{n_2} - u_0^{l_0^{(2)}}\, u_1^{l_1^{(2)}} = 0\\ &\vdots\\ f_g &= u_g^{n_g} - u_0^{l_0^{(g)}} \ldots u_{g-1}^{l_{g-1}^{(g)}} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

A particular simple deformation of positive weight is given by $f_i + \varepsilon u_{i+1}$, and we may even take $\varepsilon = 1$. It is then easy to eliminate the u_i with $i \geq 2$ to obtain an equation of a plane curve. Cassou-Nogues [C-N] has shown that one can write the whole equisingular deformation of this particular curve as $\widetilde{f_i} + \varepsilon u_{i+1}$, where $\widetilde{f_i}$ only depends on the coordinates $u_0, \ldots, u_i$, so it is possible to do the same elimination for the whole stratum. However, as the curve is no longer quasi-homogeneous it is not clear whether every plane curve occurs in this family.

The easiest elimination occurs when $l_j^{(i)} = 0$ for all $j \geq 2$ and all i. Such semigroups exist for all g. They can be constructed inductively. Given $\langle \bar\beta_0, \ldots, \bar\beta_{g-1}\rangle$ with $\gcd(\bar\beta_0, \ldots, \bar\beta_{g-1}) = 1$ and such that $l_j^{(i)} = 0$ for $j \geq 2$, take a semigroup $\langle n_g\bar\beta_0, \ldots, n_g\bar\beta_{g-1}, \bar\beta_g\rangle$ with $\gcd(n_g, \bar\beta_g) = 1$, $\bar\beta_g > n_{g-1}n_g\bar\beta_{g-1}$ and $\bar\beta_g \in \langle \bar\beta_0, \bar\beta_1\rangle$.

Lemma 5.3. *The deformed curve $f_i + u_{i+1}$, with $l_j^{(i)} = 0$ for all $j \geq 2$, is stably equivalent to a seemingly non-degenerate singularity.*

Proof. In this case the equation of the plane curve is

$$\left(\ldots\left((u_1^{n_1} - u_0^{l_0^{(1)}})^{n_2} - u_0^{l_0^{(2)}}\, u_1^{l_1^{(2)}}\right)^{n_3} \cdots - u_0^{l_0^{(g-1)}}\, u_1^{l_1^{(g-1)}}\right)^{n_g} - u_0^{l_0^{(g)}}\, u_1^{l_1^{(g)}} = 0$$

This is of the form $\varphi_g^{n_g} - u_0^{l_0^{(g)}}\, u_1^{l_1^{(g)}} = 0$, and $\varphi_g = \varphi_{g-1}^{n_{g-1}} - u_0^{l_0^{(g-1)}}\, u_1^{l_1^{(g-1)}}$ is itself of the same form. The principal part is a complete n_g-th power. We apply the basic trick (Lemma 3.1) and write

$$-v_g w_g + v_g\varphi_g + w_g^{n_g} - u_0^{l_0^{(g)}}\, u_1^{l_1^{(g)}}\ .$$

Here $v_g\varphi_g = v_g\left(\varphi_{g-1}^{n_{g-1}} - u_0^{l_0^{(g-1)}}\, u_1^{l_1^{(g-1)}}\right)$, so we apply the basic trick once more, now to $v_g\varphi_{g-1}^{n_{g-1}}$, and obtain

$$-v_g w_g - v_{g-1}w_{g-1} + v_{g-1}\varphi_{g-1} + v_g w_{g-1}^{n_{g-1}} + w_g^{n_g} - v_g u_0^{l_0^{(g-1)}}\, u_1^{l_1^{(g-1)}} - u_0^{l_0^{(g)}}\, u_1^{l_1^{(g)}}\ .$$

The next step takes care of $v_{g-1}\varphi_{g-1}$ and we continue inductively. The final result is

$$-v_gw_g-\cdots-v_2w_2+v_2(u_1^{n_1}-u_0^{l_0(1)})+v_3w_2^{n_2}+\cdots+w_g^{n_g} \\ -v_3u_0^{l_0^{(2)}}u_1^{l_1^{(2)}}-\cdots-v_gu_0^{l_0^{(g-1)}}u_1^{l_1^{(g-1)}}-u_0^{l_0^{(g)}}u_1^{l_1^{(g)}}.$$

□

Conjecture 5.4. *The final function above is non-degenerate, as all facets of the Newton diagram are simplices.*

We checked this in the case $g=3$. There are eight monomials, v_3w_3, v_2w_2, $v_2u_1^{n_1}$, $v_2u_0^{l_0^{(1)}}$, $v_3w_2^{n_2}$, $w_3^{n_3}$, $v_3u_0^{l_0^{(2)}}u_1^{l_1^{(2)}}$ and $u_0^{l_0^{(3)}}u_1^{l_1^{(3)}}$. The facets containing both $v_2u_1^{n_1}$ and $v_2u_0^{l_0(1)}$ are rather easy to describe, but the remaining facets, on which only one of $v_2u_1^{n_1}$ and $v_2u_0^{l_0(1)}$ lies, are more difficult, as they depend on the values of $l_k^{(i)}$. Each such a facet contains exactly six points and is therefore a simplex.

Remark 5.5. Without the assumption $l_j^{(i)}=0$ for all $j\geq 2$ the situation is more complicated and we only give the case $g=4$. The equation is now

$$\left(\left((u_1^{n_1}-u_0^{l_0^{(1)}})^{n_2}-u_1^{l_1^{(2)}}u_0^{l_0^{(2)}}\right)^{n_3}-(u_1^{n_1}-u_0^{l_0^{(1)}})^{l_2^{(3)}}u_1^{l_1^{(3)}}u_0^{l_0^{(3)}}\right)^{n_4}- \\ \left((u_1^{n_1}-u_0^{l_0^{(1)}})^{n_2}-u_1^{l_1^{(2)}}u_0^{l_0^{(2)}}\right)^{l_3^{(4)}}(u_1^{n_1}-u_0^{l_0^{(1)}})^{l_2^{(4)}}u_1^{l_1^{(4)}}u_0^{l_0^{(4)}}.$$

We start with one application of the basic trick (Lemma 3.1) to get

$$-v_4w_4+w_4^{n_4}+v_4\left((u_1^{n_1}-u_0^{l_0^{(1)}})^{n_2}-u_1^{l_1^{(2)}}u_0^{l_0^{(2)}}\right)^{n_3}-v_4(u_1^{n_1}-u_0^{l_0^{(1)}})^{l_2^{(3)}}u_1^{l_1^{(3)}}u_0^{l_0^{(3)}}- \\ \left((u_1^{n_1}-u_0^{l_0^{(1)}})^{n_2}-u_1^{l_1^{(2)}}u_0^{l_0^{(2)}}\right)^{l_3^{(4)}}(u_1^{n_1}-u_0^{l_0^{(1)}})^{l_2^{(4)}}u_1^{l_1^{(4)}}u_0^{l_0^{(4)}}.$$

Let $\varphi_3=(u_1^{n_1}-u_0^{l_0^{(1)}})^{n_2}-u_1^{l_1^{(2)}}u_0^{l_0^{(2)}}$. Then we have two terms involving a power of φ_3, so we apply the basic trick twice, followed by a coordinate transformation as in Remark 3.3 to get

$$-v_4w_4-v_{3,1}w_{3,1}+v_{3,1}w_{3,2}-v_{3,2}w_{3,2}+w_4^{n_4}+v_4w_{3,1}^{n_3}+v_{3,2}(u_1^{n_1}-u_0^{l_0^{(1)}})^{n_2}-v_{3,2}u_1^{l_1^{(2)}}u_0^{l_0^{(2)}} \\ -v_4(u_1^{n_1}-u_0^{l_0^{(1)}})^{l_2^{(3)}}u_1^{l_1^{(3)}}u_0^{l_0^{(3)}}-w_{3,2}^{l_3^{(4)}}(u_1^{n_1}-u_0^{l_0^{(1)}})^{l_2^{(4)}}u_1^{l_1^{(4)}}u_0^{l_0^{(4)}}.$$

Finally we introduce six new variables to handle the powers of $\varphi_2 = u_1^{n_1} - u_0^{l_0^{(1)}}$.

$$\begin{aligned}-v_4w_4-v_{3,1}w_{3,1}+v_{3,1}w_{3,2}-v_{3,2}w_{3,2}-v_{2,1}w_{2,1}-v_{2,2}w_{2,2}+v_{2,1}w_{2,3}+v_{2,2}w_{2,3}-v_{2,3}w_{2,3}\\ + w_4^{n_4} + v_4w_{3,1}^{n_3} + v_{3,2}w_{2,1}^{n_2} + v_{2,3}(u_1^{n_1} - u_0^{l_0^{(1)}}) - v_{3,2}u_1^{l_1^{(2)}}u_0^{l_0^{(2)}}\\ - v_4w_{2,2}^{l_2^{(3)}}u_1^{l_1^{(3)}}u_0^{l_0^{(3)}} - w_{3,2}^{l_3^{(4)}}w_{2,3}^{l_2^{(4)}}u_1^{l_1^{(4)}}u_0^{l_0^{(4)}}\ .\end{aligned}$$

References

[Arn] V.I. Arnold, *Some open problems in the theory of singularities.* In: Singularities, Proc. Symp. Pure Math. **40**, Part 1, pp. 57–69 (1983).

[Bi] Carles Bivià-Ausina, *Jacobian ideals and the Newton non-degeneracy condition.* Proc. Edinb. Math. Soc., II. Ser. **48** (2005), 21–36.

[BGM] Yousra Boubakri, Gert-Martin Greuel and Thomas Markwig, *Invariants of hypersurface singularities in positive characteristic.* Rev. Mat. Complut. **25** (2012), 61–85.

[C-N] P. Cassou-Noguès, *Courbes de semi-groupe donné.* Rev. Mat. Univ. Complutense Madr. **4** (1991), 13–44.

[DGPS] W. Decker, G.-M. Greuel, G. Pfister and H. Schönemann. SINGULAR 3-1-6 — A computer algebra system for polynomial computations. `http://www.singular.uni-kl.de` (2012).

[GLS] G-M. Greuel, C. Lossen and E. Shustin, Introduction to singularities and deformations. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Berlin: Springer (2007).

[GN] Gert-Martin Greuel and Nguyen Hong Duc. *Some remarks on the planar Kouchnirenko's theorem* Rev. Mat. Complutense **25** (2012), 557–579.

[JS] Theo de Jong and Duco van Straten, *On the base space of a semi-universal deformation of rational quadruple points.* Ann. of Math. (2) **134** (1991), 653–678.

[Kou] A.G. Kouchnirenko, *Polyèdres de Newton et nombres de Milnor.* Invent. Math. **32** (1976), 1–31.

[Lu] Ignacio Luengo, *The μ-constant stratum is not smooth.* Invent. Math. **90** (1987), 139–152.

[Pe] Ruud Pellikaan, *Finite determinacy of functions with nonisolated singularities.* Proc. London Math. Soc. /3)**57** (1988), 357–382.

[Se] Peter Seibt, *Differential filtrations and symbolic powers of regular primes.* Math. Z. 166 (1979), 159–164.

[Si] Dirk Siersma, *The monodromy of a series of hypersurface singularities.* Comment. Math. Helv. **65** (1990), 181–197.

[St] Jan Stevens, *On the μ-constant stratum and the V-filtration: an example.* Math. Z. **201** (1989), 139–144.

[Te] Bernard Teissier, Appendix to : O. Zariski, Le problème des modules pour les branches planes. Course given at the Centre de Mathématiques de l'Ecole Polytechnique, Paris, October–November 1973. Second edition. Hermann, Paris, 1986. English translation by Ben Lichtin, University Lecture Series, **39** (2006).

[Va] A.N. Varchenko, *Zeta-function of monodromy and Newton's diagram.* Invent. Math. **37** (1976), 253–262.

[Wa] C.T.C. Wall, *Newton polytopes and non-degeneracy.* J. Reine Angew. Math. **509** (1999), 1–19.

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Chalmers University of Technology and University of Gothenburg. SE 412 96 Gothenburg, Sweden
E-mail address: stevens@chalmers.se